

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 85-478
S. 3342

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of S. 33421
Digest of Public Law 85-4782

Index and summary of S. 3342

Jan. 16, 1958	Sen. Humphrey introduced S. 3002 which was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Jan. 23, 1958	Sen. Aiken and others introduced S. 3070 which was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Jan. 27, 1958	Sen. Thye introduced S. 3145 which was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Feb. 24, 1958	Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported S. 3342, an original bill. S. Report No. 1319. Print of bill and report.
Mar. 3, 1958	Senate passed S. 3342 without amendment.
Mar. 4, 1958	S. 3342 was referred to the House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as referred.
June 30, 1958	House passed S. 3342 without amendment under suspension of the rules.
July 1, 1958	Approved: Public Law 85-478.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 85-478

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM. Provides that for each of the three fiscal years, July 1, 1958 to June 30, 1961, not to exceed \$75,000,000 of CCC funds shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, and in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. Provides that funds expended under the act and under the authority contained in the last sentence of Sec. 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not be considered as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the price-support program.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 16, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY introduced the following bill ; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To extend the special milk program for an additional two-year period.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the last sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural
4 Act of 1949, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1446), is amended
5 by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof the word
6 "four", and by striking out "1958" and inserting in lieu
7 thereof "1960".

I

A BILL

To extend the special milk program for an additional two-year period.

By Mr. HUMPHREY

JANUARY 16, 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3070

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 23, 1958

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. IVES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. PAYNE) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning
4 July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1960, not to exceed
5 \$75,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corpora-
6 tion shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk
7 by children (1) in nonprofit schools of high-school grade
8 and under; and (2) in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care
9 centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar non-

A BILL

To continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

By Mr. AIKEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MANSFIELD,
Mr. IVES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. PURCELL, Mr.
DOUGLAS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr.
WILEY, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. PAYNE

JANUARY 23, 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

1 profit institutions devoted to the care and training of chil-
2 dren. Amounts expended hereunder and under the authority
3 contained in the last sentence of section 201 (c) of the
4 Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not be considered
5 as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the
6 price-support program.

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3145

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 27, 1958

Mr. THYE introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning
4 July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1960, not to exceed
5 \$75,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corpo-
6 ration shall be used increase the consumption of fluid milk
7 by children (1) in nonprofit schools of high-school grade
8 and under; and (2) in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care
9 centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar non-
10 profit institutions devoted to the care and training of chil-

1 dren. Amounts expended hereunder and under the author-
 2 ity contained in the last sentence of section 201 (c) of the
 3 Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not be con-
 4 sidered as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying
 5 out the price-support program.

87TH CONGRESS
 2d Session

S. 3145

A BILL

To continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

By Mr. THYE

JANUARY 27, 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
 Agriculture and Forestry

Feb. 24, 1958

14. DAIRY INDUSTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported ~~two~~ original bills: ~~S. 3341, to extend the Armed Forces dairy products program for 3 years (S. Rept. 1318). p. 2217; S. 3342, to continue the special milk program for children (S. Rept. 1319). p. 2217~~
- Sen. Proxmire criticized the proposed cut in dairy price supports, and inserted his testimony before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and resolutions from Wis. farm organizations opposing such reductions. pp. 2225-6
- Both Houses received a S. C. Legislature resolution urging Congress to support milk prices at \$3.25 a hundredweight, and a 1946-8 base for manufactured milk parity prices. pp. 2214, 2309
- Sen. Cotton inserted a resolution of the Granite State Dairymen's Ass'n favoring a gradual reduction of all price supports. p. 2216
15. LIVESTOCK. Sen. Smathers criticized this Department for its refusal to permit a private zoo in Fla. to import a giraffe, and inserted the decision of the Court of Appeals upholding the right of the zoo to receive the animal. pp. 2269-72
16. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Stennis urged that the fiscal year 1959 ACP program be continued on the 1958 level, and that sums not used for conservation reserve payments be made available for the program. He inserted statistics on these programs. pp. 2239-41
17. FARM PROGRAM. Sens. Church and Long discussed farm problems, and Sen. Church urged that farm prices be maintained at a high level, with production controls to prevent surpluses, and that the problems of farmers be explained more fully to non-farmers. pp. 2273-5
18. PERSONNEL. Sen. Stennis, for himself and Sen. Carlson, submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to S. 734, the classified pay bill. p. 2221
19. POSTAL RATES. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments H. R. 5836, to readjust postal rates and establish a Congressional policy for determining postal rates (S. Rept. 1321). (p. 2217) This became the Senate's pending business (p. 2273)
- Sens. Hayden, Lausche, and Martin of Pa. discussed the Post Office deficit and the proposed postal rates increase. pp. 2236-9
20. STATEHOOD. Sen. Church urged that the question of statehood for Alaska be kept separate from that of Hawaii, and inserted a resolution of the Democratic National Committee urging Congress to pass S. 45, to admit Alaska as a state. p. 2229
21. INTEREST RATES. Sen. Fulbright stated that the delay in consideration of S. 2427, to increase the interest rates of Federal lending programs, was caused by the lack of information from the Budget Bureau on the effect of the bill on such loan programs. pp. 2241-3
22. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Morse endorsed the idea of a multilateral foreign aid program, such as that proposed by Sen. Monroney in S. Res. 264, favoring the establishment of an International Development Ass'n. He inserted an article on the proposal. pp. 2249-50

23. FORESTRY. Sen. Morse inserted an editorial alleging that while there has been no mining activity on the Al Sarena tract, Ore., 3 million board feet of timber have been cut off it, and calling this a "scandalous giveaway." p. 2252
24. SOIL BANK. Both Houses received from the S. C. Legislature a resolution urging Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to enable all farmers who apply to participate in the soil bank program. pp. 2214, 2309
25. TOBACCO. Sen. Talmadge inserted a Ga. Legislature resolution urging that tobacco acreage allotments be restored to their 1956 levels. p. 2215
26. RURAL LIBRARIES. Sen. Wiley inserted a resolution of the American Library Ass'n urging Congress to appropriate the full authorized sum under the Library Services Act to extend library service to rural areas. pp. 2215-16
27. EDUCATION. Sen. Wiley inserted a resolution of the Madison, Wis., Federation of Labor protesting against any reduction of Federal aid for vocational education. p. 2216

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

28. DISASTER LOANS. S. 2920, to authorize disaster loans to small business concerns suffering economic loss as a result of excessive rainfall. Approved February 22, 1958 (Public Law 85-335, 85th Congress).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

29. WATER RESOURCES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Blatnik emphasizing the necessity for an effective water conservation and utilization program and describing the responsibility for pollution abatement. pp. A1635-42
Rep. McGovern inserted excerpts from a speech urging full development of water resources for electric power, flood control, water conservation and recreational activities. p. A1653
Rep. Blatnik inserted Charles H. Callison's, Nat'l Wildlife Federation, testimony before the House Committee on Intergovernmental Relations analyzing water pollution problems. pp. A1654-5
Rep. Blatnik also inserted Mayor Weatherford's, Independence, Mo., statement on this same subject. pp. A1657-9
30. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Engle inserted an editorial, "Benson Paints Partial Picture of Farm Plight." pp. A1652-3
Rep. Weaver inserted an editorial, "Benson Must Go," criticizing the administration's farm program.
Extension of remarks of Rep. Alger stating that "Secretary Benson has undoubtedly one of the toughest jobs in Government and he is manfully striving to look after the farmers' interest..." and inserting an editorial on this subject. p. A1688
31. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Rep. Curtis inserted Secretary of State Dulles' statement in support of the President's proposal to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. pp. A1655-7
Rep. Moss inserted Lamar Fleming's testimony in support of renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. pp. A1670-1

SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM EXTENSION

FEBRUARY 24, 1958.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3342]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported an original bill (S. 3342), to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools, with a recommendation that it do pass.

This bill extends the special school milk program for 3 years to June 30, 1961. It would make no change in the program.

The present authority for the special school milk program is contained in section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and expires June 30, 1958. In order to recognize the primary purpose of the program as improved nutrition for schoolchildren, the bill provides for the extension of the program by separate legislation, not amendatory of the Agricultural Act of 1949; and specifies that amounts expended under either the original or the extended program shall not be considered as amounts expended for price support purposes. The Secretary of Agriculture in recommending extension of the program testified on January 17 as follows:

We are recommending a 2-year extension in the special milk program to increase fluid milk consumption by children in schools, summer camps, and child-care institutions. This will extend the present annual authorization of \$75 million through June 30, 1960. This program is making an outstanding contribution to the expansion of markets for fluid milk. Equally important, it is providing more children with more milk—a very real improvement as far as their dietary needs are concerned.

During 1957, participating children consumed 1.8 billion half pints of milk, a 29 percent increase over 1956, and expenditures totaled \$61 million. An additional 1.8 billion half pints of milk were consumed under the national school

lunch program. So, as a result of the two programs, children consumed 3.6 billion half pints of milk last year.

It is anticipated that the annual cost of the program will approximate the full \$75 million authorized by the bill.

A statement prepared by the Department of Agriculture describing the program administered under the authority to be extended is set out below. Participating schools receive the amount by which the cost of the milk to the children is reduced below the cost of the milk to the school (including the handling costs allowed), but not more than the maximum amount specified in the statement.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL MARKETING
SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

The special milk program was initially authorized under the Agricultural Act of 1954 and provided for the use of \$50 million of CCC funds for a milk program in schools for each of the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. In April 1956, legislation was enacted to extend the program through 1958 and to increase the authorization to \$60 million for 1956 and \$75 million for 1957 and 1958. The program was also extended to include all nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children. Subsequent legislation, in July 1956, removed the reference to underprivileged children. The primary objective of the program is to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children of school age and, thereby, help to reduce the movement of manufactured dairy products into CCC inventories.

Assistance is provided to eligible schools and child-care institutions in the form of reimbursement payments, for milk consumed by the children. Methods of encouraging increased milk consumption are determined by those who know most about the opportunities—the local school official, or the director of the child-care institution. These local people decide when and how the milk is to be offered to children, and—if the milk is sold as a separate item—what price is to be charged the children. Then, the school or child-care institution applies for participation in the program.

The Department of Agriculture has established the maximum amounts that may be paid to any participating school or institution. Schools serving type A or B meals under the national school lunch program may receive up to 4 cents reimbursement for each half pint served in excess of the first half pint in a type A or B lunch. All other schools and all child-care institutions may receive up to 3 cents reimbursement for each half pint of milk served to children.

If the school or child-care institution offers milk to children as a separately priced item, maximum use of the reimbursement payments must be made to reduce the price of milk to children. Within the maximum rates established by the

Department of Agriculture, the amount of reimbursement provided will depend upon the cost of milk to the school or child-care institution, the proposed selling price to children, and the cost of handling milk within the school or institution. In general, it is expected that such handling cost will not exceed 1 cent per half pint.

Boarding or institutional schools, summer camps, and many child-care institutions usually do not offer milk as a separately priced item to children. When such schools and institutions apply for participation, they outline the planned methods and practices by which they intend to increase milk consumption by children. The schools and institutions are then reimbursed for the cost of the additional milk served to children.

During the first year of operation a total of approximately 450 million half pints of milk were consumed by children in 41,000 schools at a Federal expenditure of \$17.1 million. The second year of operation there were 62,266 schools participating in which \$45.8 million of Federal funds were expended reimbursing the consumption of 1.4 billion half pints of milk. This past year (fiscal year 1957) children in 71,239 schools and child-care institutions consumed about 1.75 billion half pints at a Federal expenditure of \$60.5 million.

COMPARISON WITH EXISTING LAW

The bill makes no change in existing law, but provides new authority for a program now authorized by existing law. For the purpose of comparing the new authority with the existing authority, language which is contained in both the existing law and the bill is shown in bold face type as follows:

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

SEC. 201 (c) * * *

For the period beginning September 1, 1954, and ending June 30, 1955, not to exceed \$50,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, not to exceed \$60,000,000, and **for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1958, not to exceed \$75,000,000, of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in (1) nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under; and in (2) nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.**

THE BILL

That for each of the three fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1961, not to exceed \$75,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children (1) in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under; and (2) in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar

nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. Amounts expended hereunder and under the authority contained in the last sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not be considered as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the price-support program.



Calendar No. 1339

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3342

[Report No. 1319]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 24, 1958

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported the following bill; which was read twice and placed on the calendar

A BILL

To continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That for each of the three fiscal years in the period begin-
4 ning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1961, not to exceed
5 \$75,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corpo-
6 ration shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid
7 milk by children (1) in nonprofit schools of high-school grade
8 and under; and (2) in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care
9 centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar non-
10 profit institutions devoted to the care and training of chil-

1 dren. Amounts expended hereunder and under the author-
 2 ity contained in the last sentence of section 201 (c) of the
 3 Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not be con-
 4 sidered as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying
 5 out the price-support program.

Calendar No. 1339

86TH CONGRESS
 2d Session

S. 3342

[Report No. 1319]

A BILL

To continue the special milk program for chil-
 dren in the interest of improved nutrition
 by fostering the consumption of fluid milk
 in the schools.

By Mr. ELLENDER

FEBRUARY 24, 1958

Read twice and placed on the calendar

March 3, 1958

SENATE

14. DAIRY PRODUCTS. Passed without amendment S. 3341, to extend the Armed Forces dairy program for 3 years. Several Sens. urged that the costs of this program should be charged to the armed services, and should not be shown as a farm program loss. pp. 2856-7
15. SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK. Passed without amendment S. 3342, to extend the special school milk program for 3 years, with a proviso that the amounts expended should not be considered as amounts expended for price support purposes. pp. 2857-9
16. BRUCELLOSIS. Passed without amendment S. 3343, to extend the accelerated brucellosis control program for 2 years. pp. 2859-61
17. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Passed without amendment S. 2752, to modify the procedures for submitting proposed surplus property disposals to the Attorney General. pp. 2843-5
Passed as reported S. 2224, to amend the procedures on negotiated and advertised disposals of surplus property. pp. 2844-5
18. PROPERTY LEASES. Passed as reported S. 2231, to authorize the exercise of options to purchase, renew, or extend leases by Government agencies authorized to dispose of surplus property. p. 2846
19. OPERATIONS FUND. Passed without amendment S. 2283, to authorize GSA to establish a permanent administrative operations fund. pp. 2845-6
20. SURPLUS DISPOSAL; COMMODITIES. Sen. Ellender announced that S. 3039 extending Public Law 480, would not be taken up until the Agriculture Committee had had a chance to study, on Wed., Mar. 5, the amendments submitted by Sen. Humphrey. pp. 2855-6
21. PUBLIC LANDS. Passed as reported S. 1538, to provide for the adjustment of legislative jurisdiction exercised by the Federal Government over land in the States. pp. 2838, 2840-3
22. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Proxmire criticized vertical integration among food producers, contending it would lead to elimination of the family-owned farm, and inserted an article, "Hog Raisers Eye A Contract Plan." pp. 2809-10
Sen. Proxmire criticized the Secretary's administration of this Department and inserted Brew Pearson's column, "Benson, Brannan Cost Compared." pp. 2810-11
Sen. Humphrey asserted that the present farm program was a basic cause of the close election in the First District in Minn. Sens. Fulbright and Humphrey stated that Republican chances would be much worse later in the year due to the farm program. pp. 2824-7
Sen. Carlson inserted statistics comparing the number of employees in the Dept. of Agriculture in 1954 with those budgeted for 1959. pp. 2827-30
Sen. Humphrey contrasted the increase in USDA employment and costs with the decrease in farm families, and asserted that a change in agricultural policy could come about only with the election of a President with a different policy. He inserted an article, "Eisenhower Lauds Benson, Bars Party Bid to Oust Him.: pp. 2830-2
Sen. Proxmire charged that the Secretary was "misleading" farmers by making erroneous predictions of changes in farm prices. pp. 2838-9

23. FOOD STAMPS; SURPLUS DISPOSAL. Sen. Proxmire pointed to instances of children who could not be given food because the relief laws required a minimum residence period, and urged a food stamp plan and abolishment of residence requirements. pp. 2839-40
24. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Humphrey inserted Clyde Ellis' speech to the National Rural Electric Ass'n criticizing alleged administrative policies toward REA and the Hoover Commission recommendations concerning REA. pp. 2846-53
Sen. Langer inserted a resolution by the Williston, N. Dak. Coop Credit Union favoring Hells Canyon Dam. p. 2780
Sen. Neuberger criticized the Federal Power Commission for its decision to build the Nez Perce dam, and inserted two editorials and an article on recent FPC decisions. pp. 2812-13
25. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Sen. Carlson urged extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and inserted a statement by the Committee of Kansas Farm Organizations opposing protective tariffs, supporting extension of Public Law 480, and urging a 5-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act. pp. 2779-80
Sen. Smith inserted a letter from the Port of New York Authority urging extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. pp. 2794-5
26. FOREIGN TRADE. Passed without amendment S. 3149, to increase the loan authority of the Export-Import Bank by \$2 billion. pp. 2832-3
27. PUBLIC WORKS. Sen. Fulbright inserted a list of public service projects in Ark., and urged that certain of these be accelerated to provide greater employment. pp. 2815-17
28. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sen. Martin, Pa., inserted a column stating that "the way out of the current recession is to persuade the organized groups in our economic system to give us an assurance of stability in wages and prices." p. 2789
Sen. Mundt stated that S. Dak. is in a strong economic position and inserted a tabulation on unemployment in the U. S. pp. 2806-7
29. SECONDARY ROADS. Sen. Martin, Pa., inserted Sen. Case's speech on the import of the secondary road system in the U. S. pp. 2789-91
30. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Smith, N. J., inserted an editorial on the recent foreign aid conference (pp. 2793-4), and an editorial on his speech urging aid to undeveloped areas (p. 2795)
31. STATEHOOD. Sens. Church, Knowland, and Murray urged statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. pp. 2796-8
32. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. Received a Miss. Legislature resolution urging Congress to support dairy prices for the coming marketing year at not less than \$3.25 per cwt. pp. 2778-9
33. WATER RESOURCES. In reporting S. 497, the omnibus rivers-harbors and flood control bill (see Digest 51, 85th-1st), the committee included in its report a statement as follows:

"Water supply is of vital importance to the maintenance of our economy and to the development of our country. Drought periods in various sections of the country have made it apparent that the water supplies of the Nation

I think we acted wisely in this case, but certainly the program should be continued for the next 3 years. So far as I know, there is no opposition on the part of anyone.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may point out that, in addition to the large amount of fluid milk which was consumed by the Armed Forces, 23 million pounds of butter and 2 million pounds of cheese were disposed of in calendar year 1957.

Mr. AIKEN. I think those items could more properly be charged to the farm-support program. However, the cost of the fluid milk should not be; but it is, and it looks like it is going to be so charged for a while.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Referring to the bill now before the Senate, I may point out that I was one of the Members of this body who introduced similar bills in past years, for reasons stated by my colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and also my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER].

Coming from a large dairy State such as Minnesota, it did not seem proper that men in the service should find it necessary to complain that they did not have all the dairy products they desired. During the years which have been mentioned, much of my mail consisted of messages from men in the armed services in Korea, Japan, the Aleutian Islands, Greenland, and Iceland, which stated that they were hungry for dairy products. As has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, if they used milk for their cereals, they had no milk to drink.

It was on that basis that I urged enactment of such legislation. I introduced a bill in this session, which has been embodied in the committee bill which has been reported and is now on the calendar. I believe that a man in the service should not be denied a glass of milk when we are blessed, as we are in this country, with an abundance of fluid milk. While a small percentage will be going into surplus, we should make every effort to see that a man in the service gets all the milk he wants, within reason, so that he may drink fluid milk or be able to use milk on his cereal or have the advantage of milk in food products prepared for him.

I am happy to see the bill being favorably considered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Enactment of the bill is bound to result in a splendid outlet for raw milk. The record shows that in fiscal 1957 a little more than \$16 million was expended for milk, resulting in an increase of about 400 million pounds in the consumption of milk by military personnel. In addition, 20.7 million pounds of butter, 1.7 million pounds of cheese, and 72,000 pounds of nonfat dry milk were disposed of. That amount may not sound very large to dairy producers from States like Wisconsin and Minnesota. Yet it is a fair outlet. With an extension of the act to the Coast Guard and Merchant Marine Academy,

along with the continued growth of the program, it is felt the payments for supplemental milk will probably level off at about \$25 million, and the value of the manufactured products transferred will level off at about \$13 million, which is quite a bit more than we provided last year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to commend the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for providing in the bill for the inclusion of the Coast Guard and the Merchant Marine Academy. I concur wholeheartedly in the remarks made by my distinguished colleagues from Vermont and Minnesota, particularly as one who was in the Armed Forces for five years during the Second World War. I recall how often many of us wanted milk when we could not get it, and wanted butter when we could not get it. It certainly is to the great interest of the country and of the men in our Armed Forces that they have dairy food, which is the best available food.

I conclude by saying I deeply resent that the cost has been charged as a loss against the dairy farmers, when obviously, if it should be charged as a loss at all, it should be charged as a cost to the armed services and the national defense effort, in which we all also firmly and deeply believe.

I am delighted to have had the opportunity to call up the bill, and I am also proud to have had a chance to concur with my distinguished colleagues from Vermont and Minnesota in honoring the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for having reported the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "December 31, 1958," wherever it appears and substituting therefor "December 31, 1961."

SEC. 2. Section 202 (b) of such act is further amended by striking out "of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, and as a part of the ration" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Coast Guard, (2)" and by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of such subsection the following: ", and (3) of cadets and midshipmen at, and other personnel assigned to, the United States Merchant Marine Academy."

CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1339, S. 3342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3342) to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill simply provides for the extension of the special school milk program to June 30, 1961. There are no other changes proposed in the program under the bill.

The present authority for the special school milk program which is contained in section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, will expire June 30, 1958. In order to recognize the primary purpose of the program, which is to improve the nutrition for school children, the bill provides for the extension of the program by separate legislation, not amendatory of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and specifies that amounts expended under either the original or the extended program shall not be considered as amounts expended for price support purposes. That is one of the new provisions of the bill.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that this program has also been of great help in disposing of fluid milk. During 1957, participating children consumed 1.8 billion half-pints of milk, a 29 percent increase over 1956. Expenditures in that regard totaled \$61 million. An additional 1.8 billion half pints of milk were consumed under the national school lunch program. So as a result of the two programs, children consumed 3.6 billion half pints of milk last year. It is anticipated that the annual cost of the program will approximate \$75 million.

Mr. President, we are now considering a fine outlet for the use of fluid milk. I wish to say that the committee was unanimous in its approval of the extension of this program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture, recommending extension of the program, and a statement submitted by the Department of Agriculture with respect to the program.

There being no objection, the excerpt and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are recommending a 2-year extension in the special milk program to increase fluid milk consumption by children in schools, summer camps, and child-care institutions. This will extend the present annual authorization of \$75 million through June 30, 1960. This program is making an outstanding contribution to the expansion of markets for fluid milk. Equally important, it is providing more children with more milk—a very real improvement as far as their dietary needs are concerned.

During 1957, participating children consumed 1.8 billion half pints of milk, a 29-percent increase over 1956, and expenditures totaled \$61 million. An additional 1.8 billion half pints of milk were consumed under the national school-lunch program. So, as

in the State Department of Agriculture as Deputy Commissioner of Agriculture, I had some of the responsibility connected with this program in Minnesota.

The late Dr. Cotton, then Executive Secretary of the State Livestock Sanitary Board, was one of the men who suggested and fought for the program to eradicate brucellosis in dairy cattle, as well as to eradicate tuberculosis. Our State did some very fine work in both fields.

When I was privileged to come to the Senate, I was very well acquainted with the program, because I had served as Deputy Commissioner of Agriculture in the State of Minnesota and later as Governor of the State. Therefore when I came to the Senate it was my desire to sit on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in order that I might continue my work in the field of health measures affecting the livestock industry, and in safeguarding the health of the public by the eradication of diseases which could be transmitted through the consumption of milk.

When the State Livestock Sanitary Board, which has as its responsibility the safeguarding of the livestock industry in the State, informed me of the shortage of funds with which to continue the program of eradication of such diseases, I immediately endeavored, through the Department of Agriculture, to have the program stepped up. It was for that reason that a year ago an increased appropriation was requested. That request was granted by Congress.

When we convened again this year, the RECORD will show, one of the first bills introduced was the bill to continue the accelerated brucellosis control program. I introduced that bill on January 27th, and it became embodied in the bill which is before the Senate. It is a most worthy legislative measure. It will safeguard the health of human beings, and it will greatly increase the productivity of dairy cattle and the profits of those engaged in the dairy industry. I say that because every time a cow is afflicted with brucellosis, it is apt to abort and lose its calf, and it may result in the cow losing its productivity for that year.

Therefore the program must continue. I commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for having given us an opportunity to vote on the subject and that we have the bill on the calendar at this early time for consideration by the Senate.

The veterinarians who administer the program for the Department of Agriculture and those who work in the respective States will have knowledge that the law to continue the program at a high rate has been passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to point out to the Senator that the testing required under the bill is being done by veterinarians for a very small fee, and that although the indemnity to be paid to cattle owners for cattle is \$25 for scrub cattle and \$50 for pure-bred cattle, the average has been below that amount. As a matter of fact, as I recall, there were four States in which no indemnity payments were made. The farmers took such great interest in the program of

eradicating brucellosis that they did it on their own. Ninety-five percent of the reactors found during fiscal 1957 were destroyed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. We certainly do not want the program to stop now, because we have made very good progress in eradicating the disease. It would be a loss of all the effort of the years past if we did not continue the program as we have in the past.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator is entirely right. It would be impossible to have an effective program unless it were a program of national scope. It must be nationwide. It would do no good to have a clean county, and next to it an infected county, or a clean herd on one side of the fence and an affected herd on the other side. The disease would be carried back and forth across fence lines or from one truck to another. Therefore a national program is the only effective program to bring about the eradication of the disease.

The work is not yet completed. However, a stepped-up program promises to bring an early accomplishment of the desired result. I might point out that it is not only dairy cows that are affected by the bill, but all cows, whether they be of a beef herd or a dairy herd. The serious danger is that the disease can be transmitted through fluid milk to the consuming public. The program is part Federal and part State. The farmer must dispose of his animal once it has been found to be infected. In that case it goes off his premises and is immediately branded. If the carcass can be salvaged, it is sold for whatever it will bring, and the difference between that and the appraised value of the animal is made up by the Federal Government and the State government. An item of importance in connection with it is that is a nationwide program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter addressed to me, as chairman of the committee, by the Department of Agriculture under date of February 14, in which they do not object to the program—on the contrary, they desire that it be continued—but recommend that the funds be appropriated directly from the Treasury, as in the case of other appropriations, instead of transferring the funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1958.
Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture
and Forestry, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your request of January 28, 1958, for a report on S. 3148, a bill to extend the accelerated brucellosis-control program under section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 for 2 additional years.

The Department recommends against the enactment of S. 3148.

The bill would extend the accelerated-brucellosis-control program 2 years to June 30, 1960. The additional 2 years would be financed through use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds as authorized by section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 465, 84th Congress, approved April 2, 1956. The purpose of the accelerated-brucellosis-control program is to eliminate both the disease and the infected cattle as rapidly as possible.

We are in full accord with the objectives of S. 3148, but have recommended against its enactment, since the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds for the purpose of accelerating the brucellosis-eradication program was a temporary measure. The Department has other adequate legislative authority to continue a brucellosis-eradication program, and funds for this work should be provided by the regular budgetary process. The 1959 budget estimates propose that the accelerated-brucellosis program be financed by a direct appropriation of \$15 million to the Agricultural Research Service.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The State Legislature of Kentucky has been considering the possibility of extending the program. Naturally, my colleague [Mr. MORTON]—who is the present occupant of the chair—and I are interested in it. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a question.

If the bill is passed, will it mean that the money will be immediately available for the program?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The Commodity Credit Corporation has funds on hand, and the bill, if enacted, will make the funds available for the program without further action, to the extent the Department sees fit to use them. I may say to the Senator, however, that it may depend upon the Budget Bureau. I understand that there are some funds available, left over from the authority now existing, but that the Department has in some way been deprived of utilizing the money by action of the Bureau of the Budget. I have interceded to the extent of my ability, but so far I have not been able to move Mr. Brundage. Quite a bit of money could be spent under existing authority, but somehow it is being held back.

Mr. COOPER. How much would be authorized for fiscal 1958?

Mr. ELLENDER. Twenty million dollars is available for fiscal 1958. The bill would authorize the same amount for each of the next 2 fiscal years. What has been made available in the past has not all been used.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to state my appreciation of the prompt action on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in getting before the Senate S. 3341, to extend the Armed Services dairy prod-

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3342

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 4, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AN ACT

To continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That for each of the three fiscal years in the period begin-
4 ning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1961, not to exceed
5 \$75,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corpo-
6 ration shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid
7 milk by children (1) in nonprofit schools of high-school grade
8 and under; and (2) in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care
9 centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar non-
10 profit institutions devoted to the care and training of chil-

1 dren. Amounts expended hereunder and under the author-
2 ity contained in the last sentence of section 201 (c) of the
3 Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not be con-
4 sidered as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying
5 out the price-support program.

Passed the Senate March 3, 1958.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

Secretary.

AN ACT

To continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

MARCH 4, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 1, 1958
For actions of June 30, 1958
85th-2d, No. 108

CONTENTS

Appropriations	36,38		
Banking.....	26		
Barter.....	3		
Buildings.....	27		
Corn.....	25		
Cotton.....	17		
Defense production.....	35		
Economic situation...23,29			
Phics.....	28		
Extension Service.....	19	Milk.....	1
Farm program.....7,20		Minerals.....	31
Flood control.....	6	Monopolies.....	10
Food stockpiling.....	30	Price supports.....	1
Foreign aid.....13,21		Public Law 480.....	3,32
Foreign trade.....	3	Recreation.....	34
Forestry.....24,34		Regulatory agencies.....	33
Livestock loans.....	2	Renegotiation.....	22
		Research.....	11,16
		Small business.....	4,12
		Statehood.....	8,18
		Surplus commodities.....	3
		Surplus property.....	14
		Taxation.....	37
		Transportation.....	5,9
		Water resources.....	15

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported omnibus farm bill. House passed bill to extend special milk program for 3 years. House concurred in Senate amendment to bill to extend special livestock loan authority. Several Representatives urged extension of Public Law 480. Sen. Jackson introduced and discussed measure to provide food and fiber stockpiling program. Rep. Coad introduced and discussed bill to extend Public Law 480.

HOUSE

1. MILK. Passed without amendment, 327 to 1, S. 3342, to extend the special milk program for children for 3 years, from July 1, 1958, through June 30, 1961. The bill authorizes use of up to \$75 million of CCC funds for each of the 3 years to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under, and in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children; and provides that funds expended for this purpose shall not be considered as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the price-support program. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 11483-492
2. LIVESTOCK LOANS. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. R. 11424, to extend for 2 years, through July 14, 1961, the authority of the Secretary to make supplementary advances to borrowers for special livestock loans. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 11492

3. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Several Representatives urged early consideration of legislation for the extension of Public Law 480. Rep. Cooley and Poage indicated the measure would require further study, particularly with regard to the barter provision. Rep. McCormack expressed concern with the effects of surplus disposals on our relations with friendly countries. pp. 11485-86, 11487-490, 11542-43
4. SMALL BUSINESS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment S. 3651, to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small business concerns (H. Rept. 2060). p. 11551
5. TRANSPORTATION. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12751, to extend the provisions of the Shipping Act of 1916 relating to dual rate contract arrangements (H. Rept. 2055). p. 11551
Rep. Harris inserted the text, as passed by the House, of H. R. 12832, the omnibus transportation bill. He stated the text of the bill appearing in the June 27 Record was not complete. pp. 11500-502
6. FLOOD CONTROL. A subcommittee of the Public Works Committee ordered reported H. R. 9924, to grant the consent of Congress to a compact between Conn. and Mass. relating to flood control. p. D614

SENATE

7. FARM PROGRAM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported ^(on June 28) an original bill, S. 4071, to provide price, production adjustment, and marketing programs for various commodities (S. Rept. 1766). p. 11398
8. STATEHOOD. Passed without amendment, 64 to 20, H. R. 7999, to admit Alaska into the Union as a State. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 11400, 11403-6, 11416-19, 11421-6, 11428-38, 11443-70
9. TRANSPORTATION. Senate conferees were appointed on S. 3778, the omnibus transportation bill. House conferees have been appointed. pp. 11426-8
10. MONOPOLIES. The Judiciary Committee ordered reported without amendment S. 721, to expedite the enforcement of Clayton Act cease and desist orders. p. D612
11. RESEARCH. Sens. Ellender and Proxmire were added as cosponsors to S. 3697, to create an Agricultural Research and Industrial Board to coordinate research into new industrial uses for farm crops. p. 11399
12. SMALL BUSINESS. H. R. 7963, to extend the Small Business Act of 1953 and increase the SBA loan authority, was made the pending business. p. 11470
13. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Bridges urged that Poland not be given foreign aid. p. 11416
14. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Sen. Thye urged enactment of S. 1318, to provide for the free donation of Federal surplus property to State and local governments for recreational purposes, and inserted a letter from the Minn. Conservation Commissioner supporting the bill. p. 11471
15. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Watkins inserted a speech by a water attorney, "Current Developments in Water Law." pp. 11471-7

House of Representatives

MONDAY, JUNE 30, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I John 4: 21: *This commandment have we from Him, that he who loveth God love his brother also.*

Eternal God, who art the inspiration of our prayers and their answer, we beseech Thee to make our hearts the sanctuaries of Thy presence and Thy love.

Purge us from all selfish and unworthy desires and may a nobler and more magnanimous spirit always rule our thoughts and aspirations.

Give us that peace which is the fruit of righteousness and help us to cultivate that love which goes out to all mankind in friendship and brotherhood.

Grant that we may never feel that we are cherishing a forlorn hope and setting our minds on a vague impossibility when we continue to pray and labor for peace on earth and good will among men.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 27, 1958, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 385. An act to authorize the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12716) entitled "An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended."

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the permanent RECORD. On page 11183 of June 26, in the phrase which I had in the RECORD "which I have not looked into," the printer left out the word "not." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRUMAN LIBRARY

(Mr. CHRISTOPHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, Independence, Mo., is not only the home of former President Harry S. Truman, but it has several other things to distinguish it.

Independence, Mo., is a quiet, peaceful city which has recently become the home of the Truman Library, an institution which will in the future be, not only a library, but a shrine and a monument to the memory of that great, courageous, and liberal man whose name it bears.

Independence, Mo., under the guiding hand of its mayor, the Honorable William T. Sermon, will continue to grow by leaps and bounds.

Independence, Mo., is a city of brotherly love and peace where, mainly due to the efforts of Mrs. Floyd L. Snyder, president of the school board, the public schools are now completely integrated, and this integration has been accomplished without a Presidential order; without the need for a single soldier, without a single court case or incident.

Independence, Mo., is a city with an estimated population of 70,000, where the people live together in peace and harmony, where all faiths, all colors, and all creeds are not just tolerated, but honored and respected.

Independence, Mo., and its achievements stand as a beacon light pointing the way to the rest of the world.

A BILL TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I take this means of informing the membership of the House that today I am introducing a bill to restrict the transfer of United States ships to foreign registry. My bill would cover vessel transfers for operation in international trade and would be effective only during periods of unemployment among American seagoing unlicensed personnel.

The United States merchant marine has long been suffering from irresponsible shipping competition flying various foreign flags of convenience for tax evasion purposes. These operations, largely American owned, using the flags of Panama, Liberia, Honduras, and Colombia, among other countries, has resulted in a greatly reduced number of active American ships and thus reduced employment of American crews.

My bill would make it unlawful without prior approval of the Federal Maritime Administration to transfer United States oceangoing vessels of more than 500 net registered tons to foreign registry during periods when unemployment

in the maritime industry is at an abnormally high level among our unlicensed seamen as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, this measure will be viewed as a moderate approach toward the solution of a serious situation, and likewise I am confident there will be general agreement that certain American owners should be discouraged in escaping entirely from the burden of taxation which American-flag owners must bear for the defense of ourselves and also to a high degree for the defense of those very nations of the free world who grant our citizens this means of tax exemption.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of Friday, June 27, at the bottom of page 11342 and the top of page 11343, there appears a colloquy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. That should be myself instead of Mr. LAIRD. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected by striking out Mr. LAIRD's name where it appears and substituting my own.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3342) to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for each of the 3 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1961, not to exceed \$75 million of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children (1) in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under; and (2) in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. Amounts expended hereunder and under the authority contained in the last sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not be considered as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the price-support program.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill extends for 3 years the special milk program for children which is due to expire at midnight tonight. This bill is identical with two similar House bills, H. R. 11178 and H. R. 12954, with the exception that the Senate bill extends the program for a period of 3 years instead of 2 as provided in the House bill.

During the next 2 months, especially, summer camps will be in session across the Nation. It has been reported that a total of 744,087 children will be attending camps which intend to participate in the special milk program during the summer of 1958. It is very gratifying to me to see that many children in more than 2,600 summer camps will have the opportunity to get this nutritious food as a result of congressional interest and action. I am especially pleased because the enabling legislation which made possible the continuance of the school-milk program during the summer camping months was accepted by the Congress and the President signed it into law in 1956 after I introduced it on May 22 as H. R. 11375 at the second session of the 84th Congress. I am happy to note that in Wisconsin there are expected to be 16,286 children in 153 camps, recreation centers, child-care institutions and schools participating in the program. I urge its acceptance.

(Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE BILL

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks on the bill at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute to voice my support of Senate Joint Resolution 181, to extend the agriculture milk program.

In my estimation, this is one of the most commendable programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. Last week, when the omnibus farm bill was before the House, many members including myself, expressed concern that this milk program which is so vital to the health of the Nation's schoolchildren would be allowed to lapse because it had been tied to a catchall agriculture bill which was indefensible and unworkable. I am very happy that the leadership has taken prompt action to call up Senate Joint Resolution 181, which had previously been approved by the Senate, and which will permit the continuation of the agricultural milk program without any interruption.

I have had an opportunity to see this program in operation in the schools in my congressional district and also in some of the summer camps and other groups which qualify for this type of Federal assistance. Without doubt, this program is one of the best investments which the taxpayers are receiving for their tax dollars, because it helps to insure and improve the health and well-

being of our schoolchildren, by providing nutritious milk which many of these youngsters would not otherwise have an opportunity to get in their daily diets. It also helps to stabilize the dairy industry which is vital to the economy of our Nation. For that reason, I am delighted that this legislation has been called up today so that the milk program can be continued and its benefits felt throughout the Nation.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my gratitude to the leadership and to the House Agriculture Committee for bringing up this vital legislation today. As has been stated by several other speakers on the floor of the House this afternoon, this desirable and worthwhile program would have expired tonight at the end of this fiscal year, were it not for this action we are taking now.

This authorization for extending the milk for the school lunch program was included in the complicated and lengthy farm bill, H. R. 12860, that the House voted not to consider. As I stated last week, I thought it was not in the public interest to delay the extension of this program until that bill was finally passed by the House and other Body, and signed by the President. Even had the House commenced debating H. R. 12860, the debate would have continued for several days in the House, and the bill would still have been destined to lengthy debate and consideration by the other Body. Even assuming that it could be passed by both legislative bodies and signed by the President, there would have been unnecessary delay for several months in the administration of this bill. The failure to continue the program would have had an adverse effect both on the consuming public and upon the milk producer.

For the last fiscal year \$75 million has been made available to provide this milk at reduced costs to the schoolchildren of America. Of this \$75 million, \$717,732 has been spent in our State of Kansas. Had the program not been operative for the ensuing fiscal year, millions of schoolchildren would have been denied this supplement to their school lunch, as well as a lessened consumption of fluid milk which would have adversely affected the interests of the dairy farmers. Since the principal segment of milk producers in my congressional district are producers of fluid milk, I am especially interested in the extension of this program.

We are inclined to think of the school lunch milk program as being only operative for the conventional school year. Those Members of the House who have had any experience with the directing of affairs of a public school are fully aware that it is necessary to commence preparation for a succeeding school year not later than July 1. That is another persuasive reason for extending this program before it was allowed to expire, thereby enabling school administrators and other persons responsible for the lunch program to make definite plans for the continuing of this program this fall.

To my knowledge there is no opposition to this resolution, and I urge its immediate approval.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How long does this extend the program?

Mr. JOHNSON. For 3 years.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and I believe it will be passed overwhelmingly by the House. I think, however, we should emphasize the point that the expense of this milk program will be charged to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The expenses should not be charged to the Commodity Credit Corporation because it is a burden that should be borne out of general tax revenues. However, it pinpoints once again the problem faced so often by the membership, and that is that the farmers of America are charged oftentimes with worthy programs, the cost of which they should not have to assume. You read perhaps casually where the appropriations for agriculture this year are approximately \$5 billion. About half of that, Mr. Speaker, will be returned to the Department by reason of loans to the REA, the Farmers' Home Administration, and other activities. The farmers of America should not be made the goat as they often are.

We talk about certain programs that are meritorious and worthwhile. The farmers of America should not be charged with the kind of money we are spending under Public Law 480, the great program under title 3 which makes food available on a person-to-person basis all over the world. It is one of the greatest programs we have in the effort to win and keep friends, but it should be charged to defense. So I say again that this is a worthwhile program. It ought to be passed. But in all fairness, although we realize this is a meritorious program, we ought not to charge the cost up to the American farmer whose burden, as you know, is already too heavy for him to bear.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Florida and say it is unfortunate that agriculture is being charged with many things that it should not be charged with. This is a very worthwhile program. It has never been controversial and I am sure it will be unanimously approved here today and that the law will be extended for 3 years.

For the information of the Members I am inserting in the Record at this point a statement prepared by the Department of Agriculture describing the program administered under the authority to be extended. Participating schools receive the amount by which the cost of the milk to the children is reduced below the cost of the milk to the school—including the handling costs allowed—but not more than the maximum amount specified in the statement.

The Department's statement follows:

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

The special milk program was initially authorized under the Agricultural Act of 1954 and provided for the use of \$50 million of CCC funds for a milk program in schools for each of the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. In April 1956, legislation was enacted to extend the program through 1958 and to increase the authorization to \$60 million for 1956 and \$75 million for 1957 and 1958. The program was also extended to include all nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children. Subsequent legislation, in July 1956, removed the reference to underprivileged children. The primary objective of the program is to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children of school age and, thereby, help to reduce the movement of manufactured dairy products into CCC inventories.

Assistance is provided to eligible schools and child-care institutions in the form of reimbursement payments, for milk consumed by the children. Methods of encouraging increased milk consumption are determined by those who know most about the opportunities—the local school official, or the director of the child-care institution. These local people decide when and how the milk is to be offered to children, and—if the milk is sold as a separate item—what price is to be charged the children. Then, the school or child-care institution applies for participation in the program.

The Department of Agriculture has established the maximum amounts that may be paid to any participating school or institution. Schools serving type A or B meals under the national school-lunch program may receive up to 4 cents reimbursement for each half pint served in excess of the first half pint in a type A or B lunch. All other schools and all child-care institutions may receive up to 3 cents reimbursement for each half pint of milk served to children.

If the school or child-care institution offers milk to children as a separately priced item, maximum use of the reimbursement payments must be made to reduce the price of milk to children. Within the maximum rates established by the Department of Agriculture, the amount of reimbursement provided will depend upon the cost of milk to the school or child-care institution, the proposed selling price to children, and the cost of handling milk within the school or institution. In general, it is expected that such handling cost will not exceed 1 cent per half pint.

Boarding or institutional schools, summer camps, and many child-care institutions usually do not offer milk as a separately priced item to children. When such schools and institutions apply for participation, they outline the planned methods and practices by which they intend to increase milk consumption by children. The schools and institutions are then reimbursed for the cost of the additional milk served to children.

During the first year of operation a total of approximately 450 million half pints of milk were consumed by children in 41,000 schools at a Federal expenditure of \$17.1 million. The second year of operation there were 62,266 schools participating in which \$45.8 million of Federal funds were expended reimbursing the consumption of 1.4 billion half pints of milk. This past year (fiscal year 1957) children in 71,239 schools and child-care institutions consumed about 1.75 billion half pints at a Federal expenditure of \$60.5 million.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage our chairman in conversation with re-

gard to what we are doing. We are not passing Senate Joint Resolution 181 because we have changed our plan and are passing S. 3342.

Mr. COOLEY. On Friday, the majority leader announced that a resolution extending the school milk program, Senate Joint Resolution 181, would be called up today. That resolution only extended the school milk program for 60 days. It occurred to me that it would be far better to pass S. 3342, which extends the program for 3 years. After discussing the situation with the majority leader and with the Speaker, it was decided that S. 3342 would be called up and considered today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. When I announced consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 181, I assumed that it was an extension for more than 60 days. I understood it was not to extend it for 60 days but for some reasonable period in the future. I want the record clearly to show that while I referred to Senate Joint Resolution 181, my intent was not to confine it to 60 days.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, if I understand correctly, we are not making any changes in the Senate bill S. 3342 but are passing S. 3342 exactly as the Senate passed it on March 3 of this year?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct. If it passes the House today it will go directly to the White House.

Mr. HILL. We have another bill in our committee that I think we are of unanimous opinion on and in support of and that is the extension of Public Law 480. Has the chairman any idea what we might be able to do with Public Law 480? I am of the opinion we can take the same type of action on Public Law 480 as we are doing with S. 3342 and pass that bill without any possibility of opposition.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not believe that our committee will accept the Senate bill. I know that we had a section in the so-called omnibus bill which was before the House last week that dealt with Public Law 480 and provided for its extension. I am in accord with the provisions of the House bill on Public Law 480. We can call it up and pass it or consider it at any time in the future. As pointed out when we considered the omnibus bill, Public Law 480 was not extended in 1956 until the month of August. In 1957 it was extended in the month of August. I do not mean to say that we should wait until the month of August this year, but I think we should insist upon the House provision dealing with Public Law 480.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the chairman understands that we could pass Public Law 480 as we have written it. We would have it in a position where it would go to conference and if there are any changes we could iron them out.

Mr. COOLEY. Unfortunately, we do not have a bill before our committee that contains the provisions of the omnibus bill relating to Public Law 480. It can

be introduced today or any Member can introduce it at any time.

Mr. HILL. May I inquire further, would the chairman be willing to accept the Senate extension of Public Law 480 as it passed the Senate?

Mr. COOLEY. No; and I do not think the gentleman would want to do that, either. We have spent considerable time on Public Law 480 and I think our provision is far superior to that contained in the Senate bill.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Would this be a possibility: Could the gentleman ask unanimous consent to suspend the rules on the Senate bill dealing with Public Law 480 and request that we pass the bill with an amendment which would strike out that particular part in which you are in disagreement. Then the House could meet in conference with the Senate on this important legislative matter. That could be done, in my opinion, without any difficulty.

Mr. COOLEY. We could strike out everything after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert the provisions of our bill, and I will give consideration to doing that at an early date.

Mr. HILL. I am sure we would all agree that we could strike out everything after the enacting clause in the Senate bill and insert our bill under the Senate title and pass it without any difficulty.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is probably correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. When Public Law 480 was passed, I had my doubts about it, I want to be frank. I voted for it with considerable reluctance and only because I thought it might be a reasonably calculated risk in connection with bartering and so forth with some of the Communist satellite countries where it affects such countries. On the other hand, I recognize that we might be relieving the economic burden of the Soviet Union by the passage of such a bill which I do not want. Now, we know that it is more or less of a disposal bill, and an important part is in connection with our foreign policy. I never intended, when I voted for that bill, that I would create in the minds of friends of ours in other countries, such as Canada, Australia, Mexico, and several other nations, a feeling that we have treated them unfairly in their international commercial transactions and in the fields that affected their very economic life. Certainly, in taking a calculated risk in relation to countries that are not friendly to us, I never intended that we should do something that would be adverse to countries that are friendly to us. And, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that in any extension of Public Law 480 the matter should receive very careful consideration, because I do not like to see the people of Canada, who have been friends of ours for decades and decades,

becoming unfriendly toward us as a result of the manner in which Public Law 480 is operating, or the people of other friendly countries.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that when this matter was being considered by our committee I asked the question if anyone had received any complaint from any businessman indicating that any of these transactions had interfered with normal trade and commerce, and we did not get any information indicating that that was true. I understand that at the Food and Agricultural Organization meeting in Rome there was a discussion about the operation of Public Law 480, and no serious complaint was made by any business man or any government in regard to the operation of this program. We have had barter transactions amounting to about a billion dollars, trading in surplus commodities for strategic materials, and that is a program I should like to see resumed.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, will seriously consider bringing Public Law 480, the Surplus Agricultural Disposal Act, to the floor of the House without further delay.

As one of the authors of this bill in 1954, I visualized that we would run into some problems as this law was renewed from time to time.

However, I have been quite close to those who have been negotiating these contracts in the Foreign Agricultural Service. They have pointed out to me as recently as 30 days ago the importance of getting the transfer of these commodities from Commodity Credit Corporation into the provisions of Public Law 480. They are ready now in the Foreign Agricultural Service and in the State Department to negotiate further contracts for the sale overseas of a considerable amount of agricultural produce. They are unable to move until this law is passed and they have the proper authority with which to negotiate.

If the chairman believes that the House version is preferable to the one passed by the Senate, then by all means bring it to the floor immediately and let us pass it. It could then go to conference, for I am sure that the differences between the House and Senate could be ironed out within a short time.

I do believe that time is the essence of success in this program. There are several countries waiting now to execute contracts. The sooner this can be done the better it will be not only for the country seeking the produce but also for the markets in this country.

This program has helped stabilize agricultural prices in the United States.

The removal of some of our surplus would have a beneficial effect upon prices in the market places within the United States.

For all of these reasons I urge the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture to move with the greatest speed in getting this bill before the House. The bill is approved by everyone. Insofar as I know there will not be six votes against the bill.

This has been an eminently successful program and throughout the years was shown to be in the public interest. There is no reason I can think of why we should not vote upon the bill within the next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In reply to the gentleman from North Carolina, on page 10974 of the RECORD of June 24, in the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], he quotes the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in which he says in part:

Title I of Public Law 480, however, and the barter provisions of title III, cause us serious foreign-relations problems with virtually all other exporters of any of the agricultural products included in title I agreements.

In carrying out this law we have a purpose and it seems to me in executing it we should not do so in a manner as to bring unfavorable feeling toward our country on the part of other countries that are friendly to us.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I wholeheartedly agree with that attitude.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. TEWES].

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Speaker, what is happening here has important significance, beyond the extension of the school milk program. There are many of us on the Agriculture committee who believe sincerely and conscientiously, that the policy of omnibus legislation—of lumping together all types of commodities on the theory that what you want for your commodity and what I want for my commodity can be passed in Congress if they are all put together—is an outdated method of legislating. We believe that any single commodity which has a justifiable cause can come before the Congress and obtain what is needed for that commodity. We believe that our constituents don't want us to forsake our better judgment on all the commodities in order to secure passage of that which will benefit us. We have, therefore, opposed omnibus legislation in committee and we have opposed here on the floor of the House.

This unanimous consent request today is a clear-cut indication that our view is right. Here is legislation which is so unopposed that it is being brought to the floor under suspension of the rules. What justification has there been for delaying it these past few months? The only justification is its use as pressure to force support of legislation pertaining to other commodities. I say

again that this principle of omnibus legislation is not doing the farmer any good. When legitimate farm legislation is combined with some which is questionable as was done last week there is an unfortunate impression that all the legislation is not deserving and is really a form of logrolling. This is a disservice to the farmer.

The school milk program had no place in the so-called omnibus agriculture bill in the first place. Neither did Public Law 480. The Agriculture Committee has not benefited the farmer by delaying the reenactment of these important programs. Congress is correcting part of the mistake by extending the school milk program today. I urge that we move equally rapidly now on Public Law 480.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill S. 3342 which passed the Senate on March 3. This school milk program can stand on its own feet and has great support throughout the United States. This bill, although passed by the Senate on March 3, 1958, was not reported to the floor of the House for action until today. Since the authority for this program expires at midnight tonight, it is most important that this legislation be sent to the President for his signature today.

The House Agriculture Committee has given as its excuse for not reporting this bill out for action earlier, the fact that it would and did include the extension of the school milk program in the omnibus farm bill. Including the school milk program in the omnibus farm bill necessarily meant that the program would be stopped in thousands of summer camps, day camps and child-care centers during this summer vacation period. I objected to considering the omnibus farm bill before the special school milk bill was extended. Only through defeating the rule on June 26, 1958, were we able to force action on the extension of this school milk program today.

The special milk program legislation was developed during my first term of office by the 83d Congress as part of the Agricultural Act of 1954. In 1956, as a member of the Dairy Subcommittee, I participated in the action to continue the original program for another 2 years and to extend it to camps and other child-care institutions. I am one of the sponsors of this legislation calling for another extension of this fine program. I strongly support such an extension.

I believe the results of the special milk program have already exceeded our expectations—and the program is still growing. Over 70,000 schools and institutions are now participating, with excellent results in obtaining increased consumption. Schools are achieving these increases in a number of ways. They are making milk a "best buy" for children through a reduced price policy. Many are offering children a chance to buy milk at recess periods as well as at lunchtime. In some areas, children can buy milk in one-third quart containers instead of the usual half-pint sizes. The

larger container is especially popular among high school boys.

The special milk program is demonstrating that children will drink more milk at school, if it is readily available and if it is reasonably priced. As a result, we are increasing markets for fluid milk. It also means that we are helping our young people to consume the amount of milk they need for sound health and sturdy development.

Wisconsin was the first State to sign an agreement with the Department of Agriculture for the operation of the special milk program back in the fall of 1954. The Lodi School District in Wisconsin was the first school system to actually participate in the program.

Remarkable progress was made in a 3-year period. Last year, over 3,700 Wisconsin schools were participating in the special milk program. Milk is now available to about 95 percent of the children enrolled in public schools in Wisconsin, and an ever-increasing number of private schools are entering the program as a result of the combined operations of the school lunch and special milk programs. In the past 3 years, milk consumption under the school lunch and special milk programs almost doubled in Wisconsin schools, increasing from about 40 million half-pints in 1955 to about 76 million half-pints in 1957. Under the special milk program alone, milk consumption in Wisconsin schools increased from 21 million half-pints in 1955 to over 53 million half-pints in 1957. And we improved upon that record this past school year. Nationwide, as operating experience has been gained, the program has been simplified for school officials. Each school is able to try to increase milk consumption in the way best suited to the local situation. Recordkeeping requirements for schools appear to be at a minimum. The reimbursement method guarantees the school against financial losses when it sells milk to children at below cost. All of these things are important to a busy school administrator. If additional simplifications are possible, I hope they will be made.

Unless the special milk program is continued, I believe there will be a substantial reduction in milk consumption in Wisconsin schools, as well as in other schools throughout the country. This, in turn, would result in a larger expenditure by the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purchase of surplus manufactured dairy products under the price support program. I do not believe anyone of us wants either one of these things to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of the House to vote for the extension of this important, worthwhile program.

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, in view of what he said earlier, that since there is an honest difference of opinion in his mind between the Senate bill and his own views on Public Law 480, whether

he expects within a matter of, say, the next couple of days, that his committee will report out an extension of Public Law 480, so that we can get it to the floor of the House, pass it, send it over to the Senate, and then to conference, in order that we may have some expeditious handling of this badly needed legislation?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to bringing a bill out as expeditiously as possible. But I should like to observe that our committee worked to bring out a farm bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin, who has just addressed the House and complained about the bill, helped to prepare the dairy section. We accepted his handiwork. Then he came to the floor, after having prepared that section of the bill and having voted for it in the subcommittee, and denounced the bill. We handled the milk section of the bill in exactly the same manner that we handled the corn and feed grains section, the wheat section, the wool section, the cotton and the rice sections. The gentleman knows that our committee, for more than 5 months, had agreed to bring out an omnibus bill.

The bill had its origin among farmers themselves. Working through a National Conference of Commodity Organizations, representatives of the various crops cast aside the prevailing divisive propaganda and influences and came together in a unified effort to work out their individual commodity problems and to understand the problems of the producers of other crops. The committees and its commodity subcommittees, beginning in January, held 120 sessions in the preparation of this legislation. We took 4,000 pages of testimony, amounting to almost 1 million words, hearing everyone who had a suggestion for improvement in the conditions of agriculture.

We went at the job in a thoroughly nonpartisan, or bipartisan, manner. The bill, as introduced in the House, was the joint and cooperative effort of Democrats and Republicans. But Mr. Ezra Taft Benson took a look at it and called it a political hodgepodge. He cracked his whip and the interests of agriculture immediately became submerged in partisan politics.

It still is beyond belief to me that a majority of this body refused to let the bill be presented for any consideration whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that this great body intends to set agriculture adrift in the economic stream, alone, without power to produce and price itself into a fair relationship with other great segments of our free-enterprise society. I believe this body ultimately will feel remorse for the events here last Thursday and will seek to right the wrong done to the farmers of America.

Mr. ARENDS. In view of the fact that we are making much of what happened the other day when we had the omnibus bill up, let me say that we are today doing something constructive in quick passage of the school milk program. Let us handle Public Law 480 the same way.

Mr. COOLEY. You could have accepted the provisions of the bill last week and sent it to the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of the bill S. 3342—the special school milk program—which is due to expire at midnight tonight. By passing this bill today and sending it to the President for his signature, we can insure continuation of this vitally important program which distributes milk to more than 2,000 summer camps, children's centers, and recreational areas, and to more than 1 million children in every State of the Union.

I believe everyone in this Chamber is in favor of this bill—both the Members who voted against consideration of the omnibus farm bill last Thursday, and those who, as I did, supported the rule to allow the bill to be considered on the floor.

Another essential agricultural program is due to expire at midnight tonight.

This is Public Law 480. It is of the utmost importance that we take prompt action here today to extend this law, because farmers—and the millions of Americans who depend directly and indirectly on a sound farm economy—will be the losers as a result of this delay.

If we neglect to export our surplus commodities under a program such as Public Law 480, we will be confronted with a resultant buildup in storage and accompanying lower allotments and lower price supports in 1959.

It is true that \$25 million in authorization funds are remaining in this program as of this date, but the fact is that after midnight these funds cannot be used to promote sales for foreign currencies or the barter program.

I feel I don't have to stress here the importance of Public Law 480. More than a billion dollars was expended last year in the disposal of such surpluses as dairy products, wheat, cotton, feed grains and oil crops. Needless to say, this program is of utmost importance to the farmers of my district—and each day we delay the extension of this program our farm economy and the entire farm program will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, this will be a sad day for farmers of the Midwest and the entire Nation if the House will not take action to extend this much-needed program.

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the prompt action being taken in passing bill S. 3342 at this time. Time is of the essence. It is part of the emergency legislation I asked to be divorced from the omnibus farm bill the other day. The bill provides for the distribution of milk to schoolchildren, to veterans, and to hospitals. I also hope the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will take the same expeditious action relative to the extension of Public Law 480. I suggest to our chairman that we report out our own version of Public Law 480 without delay. Since there seems to be some disagreement between

the chairman of the committee and the majority leader as to the barter section, it looks to me as if something will have to be done to iron out such differences on the floor of the House. In any event, I do hope the committee will report out Public Law 480 or accept the Senate version of the legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. The State Department has categorically and without reservation recommended the extension of Public Law 480. The members of our committee have received no complaints about the operation of this program.

Mr. HOEVEN. I may say to the chairman that the barter provision in our bill is controversial and opposed by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is familiar with the section. The Department seems to think there is something mandatory about it. It is not mandatory. The Secretary is given broad discretion.

Mr. HOEVEN. With the extension of Public Law 480 presented to the House as expeditiously as possible, we can iron out our differences and get something enacted into law without any further delay.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the chairman. I see that in putting the school milk program in as separate legislation, you are continuing a program that has been found by the House to be satisfactory in times past, but I want to ask the chairman of the committee relative to the report, "The primary purpose of the program is improved nutrition for schoolchildren." Is the primary purpose of this legislation to dispose of the surplus stocks or provide food for our schoolchildren?

Mr. COOLEY. The primary purpose was to dispose of surplus material. The real purpose of course has been accomplished, as the gentleman has indicated, to improve the diet of many thousands of schoolchildren.

Mr. ALGER. I wanted to observe at this time, since time is so short, that if any of us were to oppose this legislation it might simply be because we question whether it is the media of Federal Government to distribute milk or other foods. This is not to say it is not good for schoolchildren to have milk, but rather that the local government or school boards should do it rather than the Federal Government.

(Mr. ALGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, time and again I have asked that Public Law 480 be voted out by our Committee and extended, and the gentleman knows that that has been my position all along.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman. He has frankly and forthrightly stated his position.

Mr. HILL. That is all.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows, however, that when he proposed to take the Public Law 480 section out of the bill in committee that his own colleagues

on the Republican side objected and insisted that an omnibus bill should be reported.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman also stated he was in favor of bringing out 480 and passing it in plenty of time so that we can have it in force and effect without its expiring.

Mr. TEWES. If I understood the chairman correctly, the chairman of the committee reported me as having supported this legislation in committee and then having turned on it here on the floor of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. I said in the subcommittee the gentleman approved of it.

Mr. TEWES. I supported the dairy provisions in the subcommittee and when it came out I said, and the chairman will specifically remember I asked nobody to support this bill simply because the dairy provisions were in it, if they could not support the bill in good conscience and I did not want to do it in an effort to get all the commodities through.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is exactly correct and he voted against it in the full committee, and he voted against it when he voted against the rule.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all those who spoke on the pending bill may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, may I say to those Members who came into the Chamber late that we are considering the school milk bill and not Public Law 480. I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Agriculture for the expeditious reporting of the school milk bill, and particularly my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] for his untiring efforts on behalf of this measure and of the dairy legislation in general.

I wholeheartedly favor the extension of the school milk program. This is a very constructive undertaking, and merits our full support. I hope that the bill before us, S. 3342, will be enacted without delay.

I also want to take this opportunity to express the hope that the Committee on Agriculture will promptly report legislation extending the Public Law 480 program which is expiring today. This, too, is a very important program, and one which should not be allowed to expire. I have a few comments to make on this latter subject.

First, I want to commend the majority leader for bringing before the House the perplexing problem arising out of the dumping of agricultural surpluses.

This is a very complex and delicate issue, and one which has caused considerable tension among our friends abroad. Aggressive, indiscriminate, large-scale disposal of surplus farm commodities on grant or barter basis can greatly disrupt normal operation of world commodity markets, deprive some countries of their markets, and lead to serious repercussions. This is an issue

which must be thought out carefully and thoroughly, so that our action will not generate ill feelings abroad, burden our allies with new difficulties, and evoke reprisals.

Secondly, I am deeply disturbed and concerned about the extent to which the Committee on Agriculture, in drafting legislation to extend the Public Law 480 program, has projected itself into the field of foreign policy—a field which lies under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I fully realize that it is entirely within the province of the Committee on Agriculture to determine the amount of surplus farm commodities to be disposed of under this program. At the same time, I firmly believe that the disbursal of foreign currencies, generated by the program, must remain under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The utilization of such foreign currencies involves issues of foreign policy. With due respect to the Committee on Agriculture, I do not believe that it is proper for that committee to authorize the disbursal of foreign currencies for the construction of Government buildings, for United States participation in trade fairs and exchange programs, or for the financing of research in foreign publications of scientific and technical nature. Such programs involve foreign-policy decisions, which have been reserved for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

As a minimum, I believe that such decisions should have been considered jointly by the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In this regard, I am pleased that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has indicated that he recognizes that foreign-policy determinations are involved here, and that joint consultation between the two committees was in order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I would like to say to my friend, I am delighted and I am sure all the members of the committee would be delighted to have the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs collaborate with us in drafting future programs dealing with surplus commodities and export markets. But, I do not believe that any committee could more appropriately be designated as the committee to handle this particular problem than the Committee on Agriculture because we are primarily dealing with surplus agricultural commodities.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to this extent: As I stated previously, the Committee on Agriculture should determine the amount of agricultural surplus commodities which should be put up for sale, barter, or grants under the Public Law 480 program. That decision is entirely within the province of the Committee on Agriculture.

Once these quantitative limits are established, however, the actual utilization of foreign currencies accruing under the program should and must remain under

the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

There is no question in my mind, but that the utilization of funds accruing to the United States under Public Law 480, or under any other program in this category, involves issues of foreign policy—issues which are handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

For the present, our primary concern is with the extension of Public Law 480 which is expiring today. I believe that a simple resolution, of the type approved by the other body, would provide the most expeditious way of assuring uninterrupted continuation of this constructive and important program. I want to urge the chairman and the members of the Committee on Agriculture to report such a resolution without delay.

After the program is extended, there will be ample time for the appropriate committees to carefully consider various issues relating to the utilization of foreign currencies accruing under the program.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we are being told that we are now endeavoring to pass agricultural legislation for the farmer. Mr. Speaker, this sudden concern on the Republican side of the aisle is not "for the farmer". This legislation, presently before us is a school milk program, and it is a meritorious piece of legislation on its own merits, but it has very little to do with the income of farmers. It does a good job for the school children throughout the Nation. It is primarily a bill for the benefit of school children—not farmers. I must respectfully disagree with my beloved chairman when he told the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], that solving the problems of agriculture is the "primary" purpose of this school milk program. The school milk program has, as I see it, the primary purpose of taking care of schoolchildren. Our chairman correctly stated that the care of schoolchildren is the "real" purpose of the program. That is the reason we have this bill here today. That is the reason we are voting for it today rather than letting it wait. Only 21 members on the Republican side voted to even consider the farmer's problems. This bill is not to take care of the farmers. It does not help the farmers as such. It does not increase farm income one dime. It does help the school children. About 87 percent of all school children are in town. This is a city program. It is a consumer program. It is a bill to help school children and their parents.

We have heard a great deal about Public Law 480 this morning, but this does not have a thing in the world to do with that particular problem. Neither does Public Law 480 have anything to do with the price farmers get for their products. The farmer has already received his money before the farm commodity becomes subject to sale under Public Law 480. The fact that this program provides an outlet for the commodities Mr. Benson has in stock in the Commodity Credit Corporation does

not mean that the farmer, as a producer, gets any help whatsoever.

Of course, Public Law 480 involves the welfare of farmers as American citizens, and I am for it. I was one of the original authors of Public Law 480, and I think it has done good. I think that it has helped our Government to avoid some losses which it would have otherwise sustained. I expect to support its continuation, but I would not try to fool the farmer by claiming that I am supporting this as a program for producers.

In any event, the renewal of this bill needs a lot of study. The gentleman from Wisconsin just pointed out that it would be well if we could have an opportunity to hear from the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. As our chairman has stated, and I as chairman of the subcommittee, I would like to state that we will welcome them before our committee at any time to present their views. We will be glad to hear from them. This is an agricultural problem and properly comes before the Committee on Agriculture, because it bails out the Secretary of Agriculture. It does not bail out the farmers. It bails out the Secretary of Agriculture.

What happens? When a farmer has sold his wheat to the Commodity Credit Corporation, when he has sold his dried milk, or cotton, or any other product, as a farmer, he is no more interested in what happens to those commodities than any other citizen of the United States. He has had his support. He has had the benefit of the only assistance that the Government gives him as a farmer, and from there on he is affected only as a taxpayer and as a citizen the same as all others. But the Secretary of Agriculture is affected because his disposal program looks much better under Public Law 480 than it ever did before. His account looks better because he is able to set up these sales for foreign currency as credits. That is why this great rush to take care of Public Law 480 by many of the very Members who just a couple of days ago voted against even considering any assistance to farmers as farmers. All this sudden concern could not be for farmers as producers, because there is not a farmer in America who can tell whether 480 is in effect or not as far as his income is concerned.

All of this great concern shown here today, which was not exhibited here last Thursday, all of this concern today is not about the welfare of the man who produces on the farm. It is about the welfare of somebody down here in the Secretary's office—in the Department of Agriculture. Can anyone now doubt that there are Members of this House who are more concerned in bailing out the Secretary of Agriculture than they are in protecting the producers of agricultural products?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I desire to compliment the gentleman and to associate myself with his statement. I urge the extension of this bill.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to ask the gentleman if this discussion about Public Law 480 does not prove again what a tragic mistake the House made last week when they would not permit us to get up here and talk but for a few minutes about the \$2 billion in foreign currencies in title I in Public Law 480.

Does that not indicate what a tragic error we made in denying the American farmer his day in court?

Mr. POAGE. Of course it does. Last week the very Members who are now so anxious to protect the Secretary of Agriculture's disposal record could not take time to even consider the disposal problems of individual producers. They voted and spoke against even any consideration of this program last week. Do we have more time now than we had then? Did this House not adjourn over the weekend? Can it be that our Republican friends were more interested in a Saturday of that great Republican pastime on the links than they were in the plight of the farmer—or was it simply that some of them want to attend a political convention in Indiana as the former Republican leader stated last Thursday? Or was it that they just do not care about farm income?

It is not for me an answer except to point out that 21 of our Republican friends, almost to a man, from great farm districts did vote to give our farmers a hearing. Those 21 I salute as statesmen more interested in agriculture than in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Texas will come in with the other 21 good and faithful Members and vote for the bill.

Mr. POAGE. I will, and I want to yield to one of them right now.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Certainly. You voted to give the farmers time to be heard and I must find time to yield to you.

Mr. JENSEN. All right.

Now, then, I must say that Public Law 480 helps the farmers. The gentleman does not mean to say it does not.

I have been for Mr. Benson on many occasions, but I believe the gentleman meant to make a good Democratic speech. I believe the gentleman is playing politics, and that does not become the gentleman. The gentleman who was kind enough to yield to me is, in my opinion, one of the really great statesmen of this Congress, and I am surprised to hear him make a political speech on the floor of the House, really, I am.

Mr. POAGE. There have been a good many political speeches made here and if this is political then it is in keeping with many speeches that have been made here recently, but I have not had time to consider the political aspects. I always felt that the best politics consisted in taking care of the needs of the people. Maybe it was not good politics for those Members who voted against any consid-

eration of the price problems of the producers to so vote.

Maybe no one has thought of politics when he urged that we now take time to pass the Secretary's disposal program, but surely this haste is not dictated by emergency which may be created by a temporary lapse in this program. It has never heretofore been renewed until up in August.

But I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that within the last 10 days the Secretary of Agriculture officially notified our committee that he had \$200 million of commodities yet available to use under Public Law 480 for which he can find no taker. If he can find any nation which today wants to buy these commodities he can sell \$200 million worth. He does not have to wait until tomorrow; he has got \$200 million worth of commodities on hand to trade on today—without any renewal. How many individual farmers have \$200 with which to feed their families—yet this House could not take time to even discuss the problems of these individuals.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. No. The gentleman from Illinois did not have any time for farm producers Thursday, and I have not any time to yield now.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COAD. I wish to state that I favor and urge action on the school milk program and also Public Law 480. These are both important to the farmer and the consumer and have proven beneficial. I am offering a bill today to extend Public Law 480 and will have more to say on that a little later today.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I hope we adopt this milk program. It is in the interest of the school children. A lot of city people need it. I am for the city people too, I am for helping them out, even for helping pay their kids' school lunch bill. I am for this city bill, even though a few of our city friends could not see their way clear to consider a farm bill. Of course, many of the Democratic Members have always been interested in farmers and so voted. Anyway, my support of this school milk bill is not dependent on how anyone else has voted or is going to vote. I am for it because I think that it is helpful for many of our people. I just don't want to let anyone think that this is a farm relief bill.

I am even for the bill to bail out the Secretary of Agriculture. Let us bring that bill up in due course and consider it in due course. I am glad to consider it and have studied it seriously but I am not going to be stampeded into ill-considered action when the Secretary of Agriculture has \$2000 million of commodities on hand now.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, economic and political considerations aside, I must heartily approve inclusion of this bill.

I know of no legislation carrying a comparable Federal appropriation that has, and will, continue to promote the universal use of our Nation's most valuable natural foods.

The special school milk programs contribute to the needs of children during

their physical development periods and helps materially in the building of strong bodies, enabling them the better to withstand the stresses and strains of later life.

Better nourishment in early life will tend to reduce the occurrence of physical and mental derelicts that become the responsibility of organized society.

(Mr. COAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce to the membership of this House that I have today dropped a bill in the hopper which, if enacted, will extend Public Law 480. As we are all aware, this extension was included in the omnibus farm bill which was defeated on the rule last week.

Now there are those here today who are considerably exercised about whether Public Law 480 is to be passed again. I am certain in my own mind after having visited with many Members about this that there is no opposition to this measure and that it will be passed and the law extended.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 480 has proven to be a useful weapon both for disposing of our agricultural surpluses and for making good use of the commodities. We have contributed to the welfare not only of our farmers but also of many of the world's people in this program.

However, I am also reminded that on a recent trip to Spain the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, turned down making sales of cotton to that country on the reasoning that to dispose of the amount of cotton called for would have raised the price-support figure for the cotton farmers. How many sales of corn and other commodities we have lost out on for the same reason I do not know. It is going to make little difference whether we pass this bill or not if the Secretary is going to refuse to dispose of the surplus commodities. In fact, we have been told here today that the Secretary, right now, has over \$200 million worth of surplus stocks of corn, wheat, and other agricultural products remaining to be traded or bartered under the authority of the present program.

We know that there are big crops to be harvested this year and it is vital that Public Law 480 be continued. My bill would continue the Trade Development and Assistance Act for another year and would broaden the Secretary's authority to move our surpluses under this program.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken and the Chair announced that in the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds had voted to suspend the rules.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will

notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 327, nays 1, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—327

Abernethy	Dowdy	McGregor
Adair	Doyle	McIntire
Albert	Durham	McIntosh
Alexander	Elliott	McMillan
Allen, Calif.	Engle	McVey
Allen, Ill.	Everett	Machrowicz
Anderson,	Evins	Mack, Ill.
Mont.	Fascell	Mahon
Andrews	Feighan	Mailliard
Arends	Fenton	Marshall
Ashley	Fino	Martin
Ashmore	Fisher	Matthews
Aspinall	Flood	Meador
Auchincloss	Flynt	Merrow
Avery	Forand	Michel
Ayres	Ford	Miller, Md.
Bailey	Forrester	Mills
Baldwin	Frazier	Minshall
Baring	Frelinghuysen	Mitchell
Barrett	Friedel	Morano
Bates	Gathings	Morgan
Baumhart	George	Moss
Beamer	Granahan	Moulder
Beckworth	Grant	Mumma
Belcher	Gray	Murray
Bennett, Fla.	Green, Oreg.	Natcher
Bennett, Mich.	Gregory	Neal
Berry	Griffin	Nicholson
Betts	Griffiths	Nimtz
Blatnik	Gross	Nix
Blitch	Gubser	Norblad
Boggs	Hale	Norrell
Boland	Haley	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolling	Harden	O'Hara, Ill.
Bolton	Hardy	O'Hara, Minn.
Bonner	Harrison, Nebr.	O'Konski
Bosch	Harrison, Va.	Ostertag
Bow	Harvey	Passman
Boykin	Haskell	Patman
Boyle	Hays, Ark.	Patterson
Bray	Hays, Ohio	Pelly
Breeding	Hébert	Perkins
Brooks, Tex.	Hemphill	Pfost
Broomfield	Henderson	Philbin
Brown, Ga.	Herlong	Pilcher
Brown, Mo.	Heslton	Pillion
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Poage
Broyhill	Hiestand	Poff
Budge	Hill	Polk
Burleson	Hoeven	Preston
Bush	Hoffman	Price
Byrd	Hollfield	Prouty
Byrne, Ill.	Holland	Quile
Byrne, Pa.	Holmes	Rabaut
Byrnes, Wis.	Holt	Ray
Canfield	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Cannon	Hosmer	Reed
Carnahan	Huddleston	Rees, Kans.
Carrigg	Hull	Reuss
Cederberg	Hyde	Rhodes, Pa.
Celler	Ikard	Riehlman
Chamberlain	Jackson	Riley
Chelf	Jarman	Roberts
Chenoweth	Jensen	Robson, Ky.
Chiperfield	Johansen	Rodino
Christopher	Johnson	Rogers, Colo.
Church	Jonas	Rogers, Fla.
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Mass.
Clevenger	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Tex.
Coad	Judd	Roosevelt
Coffin	Karsten	Rutherford
Collier	Kean	Sadiak
Cooley	Keating	Santangelo
Corbett	Kee	St. George
Cretella	Kilday	Saund
Cunningham,	Kilgore	Saylor
Iowa	King	Schenck
Cunningham,	Kitchin	Scherer
Nebr.	Knox	Schwengel
Curtin	Knutson	Scott, N. C.
Curtis, Mass.	Krueger	Scott, Pa.
Curtis, Mo.	Lafore	Scrivner
Dague	Laird	Scudder
Davis, Ga.	Landrums	Seeley-Brown
Davis, Tenn.	Lane	Selden
Dawson, Ill.	Lankford	Sheehan
Dawson, Utah	LeCompte	Sheppard
Dennison	Lesinski	Sikes
Dent	Libonati	Siler
Denton	Lipscorn	Simpson, Ill.
Devereux	Loser	Sisk
Dingell	McCormack	Smith, Calif.
Dixon	McCulloch	Smith, Kans.
Donohue	McDonough	Smith, Miss.
Dooley	McFall	Smith, Va.
Dorn, S. C.	McGovern	Spence

Springer	Ullman	Widnall
Stauffer	Utt	Wier
Sullivan	Vanik	Wigglesworth
Teague, Calif.	Van Pelt	Williams, Miss.
Teague, Tex.	Van Zandt	Willis
Tewes	Vinson	Wilson, Ind.
Thomas	Vorvys	Winstead
Thompson, La.	Walter	Withrow
Thompson, N. J.	Watts	Wolverton
Thompson, Tex.	Weaver	Wright
Thomson, Wyo.	Westland	Yates
Tollefson	Wharton	Young
Tuck	Whitener	Younger
Udall	Whitten	Zablocki

NAYS—1

Alger

NOT VOTING—102

Abbitt	Gavin	Moore
Addonizio	Glenn	Morris
Andersen,	Gordon	Morrison
H. Carl	Green, Pa.	Multer
Anfuso	Gwinn	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baker	Hagen	O'Neill
Barden	Halleck	Osmer
Bass, N. H.	Harris	Porter
Bass, Tenn.	Healey	Powell
Becker	Hillings	Radwan
Bentley	Holtzman	Rains
Brooks, La.	James	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brownson	Jenkins	Rivers
Buckley	Jennings	Robeson, Va.
Burdick	Kearney	Robison, N. Y.
Colmer	Kearns	Rooney
Coudert	Kelly, N. Y.	Shelley
Cramer	Keogh	Shuford
Delaney	Kilburn	Sieminski
Dellay	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Derounian	Kluczynski	Staggers
Dies	Latham	Steed
Diggs	Lennon	Taber
Dollinger	McCarthy	Talle
Dorn, N. Y.	Macdonald	Taylor
Dwyer	Mack, Wash.	Teller
Eberharter	Madden	Thornberry
Edmondson	Magnuson	Trimble
Fallon	Mason	Vursell
Farbstein	May	Wainwright
Fogarty	Metcalf	Williams, N. Y.
Fountain	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Calif.
Fulton	Miller, Nebr.	Zelenko
Garmatz	Miller, N. Y.	
Gary	Montoya	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Glenn.
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hillings.
 Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Taber.
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Miller of New York.
 Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Coudert.
 Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
 Mr. Trimble with Mr. Dorn of New York.
 Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Baker.
 Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Kilburn.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wilson of California.
 Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Osmer.
 Mr. Multer with Mr. Mason.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Brownson.
 Mr. Fountain with Mr. Fulton.
 Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Derounian.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Gavin.
 Mr. Rains with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
 Mr. Rooney with Mr. Kearns.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Robison of New York.
 Mr. Teller with Mr. Vursell.
 Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Talle.
 Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
 Mr. Healey with Mr. Moore.
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. May.
 Mr. McCarthy with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Becker.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Kearney.
 Mr. Metcalf with Mr. Wainwright.
 Mr. Dellay with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Montoya with Mr. Williams of New York.
 Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. James.
 Mr. Steed with Mr. Gwinn.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Burdick.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Latham.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Mack of Washington.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Radwan.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Jenkins.
 Mr. Lennon with Mr. McDonough.
 Mr. Gary with Mrs. Dwyer.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time solely because I was the lone dissenting vote on the preceding vote on the school lunch program. I want to make it clear to my colleagues that I recognize the need to dispose of these surpluses, and I am wholeheartedly for schoolchildren drinking milk, but I am also wholeheartedly opposed to Uncle Sam being the giveaway middle man for American food, clothing, or other necessities of life. This is not the role of Federal Government.

By this vote, too, I am protesting the confusion of Congress' intent. Originally this school milk program was to dispose of surpluses. Now it is contended in the bill itself "An act to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition in fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools. This sounds like a business ad for dairy products. I, too, believe in children drinking milk. I do not believe it to be the role of Federal Government to be the distributing agent for milk. Our Constitution does not so empower the Federal Government to use the taxpayers' money. Food surpluses were a wartime emergency, the result of bonuses offered farmers to produce. They overproduced, more than meeting the challenge, and so we had to dispose of the surpluses. Earlier I asked the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, "Is the primary purpose of this legislation to dispose of the surplus stocks or provide food for our children." His answer, "The primary purpose was to dispose of surplus material." This is a clear statement contradicting the bill and committee report which says "the primary purpose of the program is improved nutrition for schoolchildren." Then the chairman went on to confuse his answer by saying, "The real purpose of course, has been accomplished, to improve the diet of many thousands of schoolchildren."

No one, not even the Federal Government, is more interested in the nutrition of our children, whether school age or not. Any food program is a local matter, not Federal. Nor should Uncle Sam be agent for the dairy industry. Therefore, I voted against making this milk program permanent legislation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the bill just passed, S. 3342, to extend the special school milk program to June 1961, is a very beneficial program to provide added nutritional value to our schoolchildren's daily diet.

I have supported this legislation on every previous occasion when it came to

the House for action. I am pleased to support it at this time.

The benefits of this bill are not only to our schoolchildren but also to our agricultural economy, because it provides an excellent means for the increased use of fluid milk.

The following statement outlines the broad scope and benefits which this program provides. Let me read this statement as it appears in the committee report:

The special milk program was initially authorized under the Agricultural Act of 1954 and provided for the use of \$50 million of CCC funds for a milk program in schools for each of the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. In April 1956, legislation was enacted to extend the program through 1958 and to increase the authorization to \$60 million for 1956 and \$75 million for 1957 and 1958. The program was also extended to include all nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children. Subsequent legislation, in July 1956, removed the reference to underprivileged children. The primary objective of the program is to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children of school age and, thereby, help to reduce the movement of manufactured dairy products into CCC inventories.

Assistance is provided to eligible schools and child-care institutions in the form of reimbursement payments, for milk consumed by the children. Methods of encouraging increased milk consumption are determined by those who know most about the opportunities—the local school official, or the director of the child-care institution. These local people decide when and how the milk is to be offered to children, and—if the milk is sold as a separate item—what price is to be charged the children. Then, the school or child-care institution applies for participation in the program.

The Department of Agriculture has established the maximum amounts that may be paid to any participating school or institution. Schools serving type A or B meals under the national school lunch program may receive up to 4 cents reimbursement for each half pint served in excess of first half pint in a type A or B lunch. All other schools and all child-care institutions may receive up to 3 cents reimbursement for each half pint of milk served to children.

If the school or child-care institution offers milk to children as a separately priced item, maximum use of the reimbursement payments must be made to reduce the price of milk to children. Within the maximum rates established by the Department of Agriculture, the amount of reimbursement provided will depend upon the cost of milk to the school or child-care institution, the proposed selling price to children, and the cost of handling milk within the school or institution. In general, it is expected that such handling cost will not exceed 1 cent per half pint.

Boarding or institutional schools, summer camps, and many child-care institutions usually do not offer milk as a separately priced item to children. When such schools and institutions apply for participation, they outline the planned methods and practices by which they intend to increase milk consumption by children. The schools and institutions are then reimbursed for the cost of the additional milk served to children.

During the first year of operation a total of approximately 450 million half pints of milk were consumed by children in 41,000 schools at a Federal expenditure of \$17.1 million. The second year of operation there were 62,266 schools participating in which \$45.8 million of Federal funds were expended

reimbursing the consumption of 1.4 billion half pints of milk. This past year (fiscal year 1957) children in 71,239 schools and child-care institutions consumed about 1.75 billion half pints at a Federal expenditure of \$60.5 million.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1958

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

JUNE 30, 1958.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on June 27, 1958, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, June 27, 1958, the following message:

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12181) entitled "An act to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, United States of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Friday, June 27, 1958, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the House: H. R. 12181, "An act to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes."

SPECIAL LIVESTOCK LOANS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11424) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to extend special livestock loans, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "(12 U. S. C. 114-8a (c))" and insert "(12 U. S. C. 1148a-2 (c))."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' BURIAL ALLOWANCE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 11801) to amend sections 802 and 803 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to increase the burial allowance for deceased veterans from \$150 to \$250.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 802 and 803 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 are each amended by striking out "\$150" and inserting "\$250."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to deaths occurring after the date of enactment of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill increases the amount that the Veterans' Administration may pay for burial allowance for a deceased veteran from \$150 to \$250. Sections 802 and 803 of Public Law 85-56 presently authorizes the \$150 sum.

The benefit is payable only to a veteran who served during a period of war; or who had been discharged in the service with a service-connected disability; or who was receiving compensation.

This benefit was increased by Public Law 529 of the 79th Congress in 1946, when it was raised from \$100 to \$150. The increase proposed by this bill simply reflects the economic factor of life.

The Veterans' Administration favors the legislation and estimates that the first-year cost will be \$14,070,000 and that it will rise to the cost of \$17,850,000 in 1963. In addition, the increase in the annual cost of Veterans' Administration contract burials is estimated at \$1,200,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, one of the rewards of military service is the consolation that a veteran will not be neglected, even in death.

The custom of providing a burial allowance for veterans, while serving a practical purpose, is also another mark of respect by the Federal Government for the men and women who were members of the Armed Forces during the emergency of war or who had become disabled in the line of duty.

To me this is a token of our continuing gratitude for the sacrifices made by our veterans and a reverence for their memory from the instant of death on. That is why it is paid without regard to financial need and as a partial contribution toward the burial expenses.

The Veterans' Administration, in favoring this legislation, correctly points out the increased costs of a casket, preparation of the body, use of rolling stock, chapel, slumber room, grave plot, opening and closing of the grave, and the concrete liner or vault that is now required in many cemeteries.

These are strong material arguments in support of the bill to increase veterans' burial allowances and reflects the increased costs of living which pursue a man even to his grave.

But I like to think of this in a spiritual vein; as a symbol of the United States Government's participation, along with members of the immediate family, in the responsibilities of caring for the last needs of a loved one before his remains are consigned to the bosom of the earth. As partners in a clean burial, by the grace of God, for the veterans who served our Nation with such devotion.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs recommends the passage of H. R. 11801. I am sure that the House will vote for

this bill as proof of the fact that we shall never forget our veterans and our respect for them in death as in life.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO], the author of the bill.

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to increase from \$150 to \$250 the maximum amount payable by the Veterans' Administration for the funeral and burial expenses of our deceased veterans.

Under the present law when a veteran dies who, first, was a veteran of any war; second, had been discharged from the service for a service-connected disability; or third, was receiving disability compensation, the Veterans' Administration may pay up to \$150 to cover the funeral and burial expenses of the deceased veteran.

This benefit allowance has remained at \$150 since 1946 although as everyone knows all costs have greatly increased in the past 12 years. As the result of increased costs, it is most difficult to secure contracts for complete burials within the present allowance of \$150. As a matter of fact, \$150 is hardly enough today to serve as a downpayment on a decent funeral and burial. The present allowance of \$150 has become unrealistic.

Most of the funeral firms refuse to undertake burial contracts because it costs them more than the present allowance. In many cases, the cemetery costs now exceed \$100, leaving less than \$50 to cover the costs of a casket, preparation of the body, use of hearse or common carrier, chapel, slumber room and services of a clergyman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for introducing this excellent piece of legislation, which is very much needed. We have been waiting to get some action with reference to this problem for a long time. It deserves the support of every Member of Congress.

(Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his consideration.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the present allowance of \$150 is most inadequate to provide final burial for a deceased veteran.

By increasing this allowance to \$250 as provided in this bill, we will be a little more realistic although \$250 could only provide a modest burial.

If we increase this allowance to \$250 we would be helping to defray part of the funeral and burial costs which are usually borne by widows, children or parents who may have also incurred hospital and medical expenses during the veterans' last illnesses.

This is a good, meritorious bill which is justified by the present conditions and circumstances.

Public Law 85-478
85th Congress, S. 3342
July 1, 1958

AN ACT

72 Stat. 276.

To continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for each of Milk the three fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending program. June 30, 1961, not to exceed \$75,000,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children (1) in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under; and (2) in nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children. Amounts expended hereunder and under the authority contained in the last sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not be considered as amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the price-support program.

Approved July 1, 1958.

